[11th February 1959

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Yes. The Government have sanctioned the formation of a Public-*cum*-Children's Park and a Deer Park at an estimated cost of Rs. 1·19 lakhs for implementation during the current financial year. The work is now in progress.

VIDWAN T. MUTHUKANNAPPAN: ஐயா அந்த இடம் அடையாற்றுக்கும் சைதாப்பேட்டைக்கும் வெகு தொலை தூரத்தில் தனித்து இருப்பதால், அந்த இடத்திற்கு ஜனங்களும், பிள்ளைகளும் பெரும்பாலும் வரமாட்டார்கள். ஆகவே வேறு ஒரு இடத்தைப்பற்றி யோசிக்க அரசாங்கம் முன் வருமா ?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : பார்க் என்பது கடையில் விற்கக்கூடிய பொருள் அல்ல. எங்கே பார்க்குக்குத்தகுந்த இடம் இருக்கிறதோ, அங்கேதான் அதை ஏற்படுத்த வேண்டும். அப்படிப்பட்ட வசதி அங்கேதான் இருக்கிறது. அந்த இடம்தான் இந்தியாவிலேயே, ஏன் உலகத்திலேயே, இருக்கக்கூடிய அழகான இடம் என்று பல நிபுணர்கள் சொல்லியிருக்கிறார்கள். அந்த அமைப்பு அங்கேதான் இருக்கிறது. முன்பு இருந்த கவர்னர் அவர்கள் அந்த இடத்தை நம்மிடம் ஒப்படைத்திருக்கிறார். அங்கேதான் ஏராளமான மான்கள் இருக்கின்றன. பறவைகளும் அந்த ஏரியாவில்தான் அதிகமாக இருக்கின்றன. அதனால் வேறு எந்த இடத்தையும் தேடிக்கொண்டு போகவேண்டாம் என்று தோன்றுகிறது.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Questions are over.

[*Note*.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—DISCUSSION ON THE GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS—*cont.*

* MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, the Leader of the House will reply to the discussion on the Governor's Address.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Mr. Chairman, Sir, concluding his Address to the Joint Session of the Madras Legislature, the Governor has expressed the hope that our deliberations will be conducted with the usual forbearance, decorum and thoroughness for which this Legislature is justly renowned. The course of the debate on the Governor's Address in this House in the last four days has fully established the assumption made by the Governor. Several speakers participated in the debate and almost every one of them had something very useful to say and some points of view to express and, in fact, many of the speeches were replete with excellent suggestions for action. The Government, both consciously and unconsciously, are influenced by the views expressed by hon. Members of this House, even though I must regret that some of the Ministers are not able to be present all the time when all the Members are speaking. Criticisms of various departments are taken note of and when those matters are taken up for consideration, certainly the views expressed by the hon. Members will receive due weight.

Sir, the practice of an Address or a Speech from the Throne which is prevalent in the British House of Commons has been followed in our Constitution. A perusal of the debates in the British House of Commons, following an Address by the King, discloses

11th February 1959] [Sri R. Venkataraman]

that the debate usually confines itself to the broad policies which the Government propose to follow during the year. The Address or Speech from the Throne itself makes succinct reference only to the policies to be adopted by the Government during the year. In comparing the debates following the speech from the Throne with those debates on the Budget, one finds that the debate on the Budget contains several references to individual grievances, local requests, requests from constituencies and so on, while the debate on the Speech from the Throne is largely confined to matters of policy. The House should, therefore, be thankful to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition for having brought out this distinction in the course of his illuminating address yesterday. He sought to confine his remarks largely to matters of policy. I shall be privileged to follow in his footsteps. In the course of my reply, I shall confine my remarks only to matters relating to the policy of the Government and if I do not touch upon very many other suggestions which have been made in the course of the debate, I am sure, the House will understand the approach I am making. It is not out of any indifference to the various suggestions that have been made that I do not deal with them in the course of my reply but largely with a desire to follow the usual practice and conventions with regard to the debate on the Governor's Address, and I propose to confine myself to the broad matters of policy that have been raised in the course of the discussion.

Sir, looking back on the four days' discussion in this House, one finds that five or six very important subjects have been dealt with, viz., the Government's land reform policy and the fixation of ceiling on holdings of land, control of food prices and State Trading relating thereto, grants to aided elementary schools, emoluments of Non-Gazetted Officers, Legislature sittings in Ootacamund, recognition of Homoeopathic system of medicine and a few others which, if time permits, I shall briefly touch upon.

I shall now proceed to deal with each one of those items. Land reform has naturally come in for much adverse criticism from all sections of the Opposition and also from one or two Members on this side. Whenever a radical change in an established order of society is contemplated, it is bound to evoke criticism not only because it is likely to deprive a section of the people of their age-old privileges but also because of a natural disinclination on the part of the people for any change that is new. This explains the opposition not only from the people who own lands but also from others who do not own lands and yet feel very strongly about it. Sir, the decision of the Government to proceed with the land reform is based on their anxiety to improve the lot of the agricultural worker, to ensure for him a higher standard of life and to provide for him a stake in the field of his occupation. It is well-known that the plight of the agricultural labourer is very hard and his standard of life much poorer than his *confreres* in the industrial and commercial sectors. The only way, according to the Government, is to create an interest in land for him so that he may be enthused to produce more not only for himself but also for society at large. The hon. the Leader of

[Sri R. Venkataraman] [11th February 1959

the Opposition criticised it as a denial of justice in order to satisfy an imaginary concept relating to social justice. Sir, you are aware that the concept of justice has varied from time to time and from clime to clime. It has never had the same connotation during different periods of history. While the preservation of the existing order of society appeals to some as justice, the creation of a new social order, in which the differences between the haves and the have-nots, between the landowners and the landless will be narrow and there will be brought about comparative equality in society, is regarded as social justice by some others. It is, therefore, a matter of approach to the problem rather than one of injustice done to any particular section of the community. In the long list of legislation

3-20 p.m. which we have undertaken in the past beginning with the abolition of zamindari in the State, followed by fixation of tenure for the tenants and followed also by the Pannaiyal Protection Act, giving a certain share to the tenant in the produce and also ensuring fair wages to the pannaiyals of Tanjore district, we have been following the policy and it has been the endeavour of the Government to see that social justice is rendered to the have-nots who are at present living on the land. A further direction of the same policy points only to the fixation of ceiling on ownership of land and the distribution of the surplus land among the landless poor of the country according to a pattern which has since been more or less decided.

There is another aspect to this question. My esteemed Friend Sri Balasubramanya Ayyar gave statistics of land holdings in the State. I am grateful to him for the figures which he has furnished. It will be found that the percentage of the people who hold lands paying less than Rs. 10 as kist is so large that actually the problem is not likely to be of very serious consequence to the vast majority of the people in the State. Actually, the percentage of the people who are likely to be affected by the fixation of ceiling will be so small that it will not create such a cataclysmic consequence as many of the hon. Members of the Opposition rather felt, would follow, as a result of this policy. Sir, I hesitate to use a stronger expression. Sir, the general approach to this problem is based purely on the economic policy of the Government in respect of land, in respect of other occupations and in respect of amelioration of the condition of the people at large. I do not pretend that the entire State is behind the Government in this matter. I am well aware that a section of the people are opposed to this reform. But if we analyse the Opposition, it largely springs from a fear that any disturbance of the existing order of society is likely to cause very serious consequences to food production and that the problem of feeding the people will become very difficult and very onerous.

Sir, the small holdings do not themselves produce the necessary food in the State. My esteemed Friend Sri Balasubramanya Ayyar said that in Japan, small holdings had been able to produce very much higher yield than what our State had been able to do. All these years, the people of our State have had small holdings and they have never been able to emulate Japan and produce the necessary quantity of food. (Interruption.) For whatever reasons it might

11th February 1959] [Sri R. Venkataraman]

be, the fact remains that people who hold small and fragmented holdings in this State and in this country have not been able to provide the necessary food and if we have to tackle the food front, also it is necessary that these small and fragmented holdings should be brought together so that food production may be improved in the State. There are various ways in which this problem has been tackled in other countries. In certain countries they have formed "Gigants", that is, large-scale farming tracts of 50 miles in length and 40 miles in width, and they have mechanised them under State control and State ownership. We are not contemplating such a radical change at all in the pattern of our agriculture or in the pattern of our holdings. The next alternative would be to bring all these people within the co-operative fold so that credit facilities may be made available to them under the co-operative method of cultivation necessary technical assitsnace and skill may be provided through these organizations, the fragmented pieces of land may be held together, sufficiently large to produce an economic unit for cultivation; and in this endeavour we have not much precedent to go by. I agree that we have not so far succeeded in having a very large number of co-operative farming societies. But that does not by itself mean that the experiment is not worthwhile. Unless we have some other alternative which can go to solve the problem of food in this country and unless we are able to find some other method by which the fragmented pieces of land can be brought together and brought under cultivation under one management, the only alternative that offers itself to the Government is to resort to the well-known method of co-operation whereby small pieces of holdings can be brought together and cultivated under proper supervision and proper skill.

Sir, in this connexion, Government are well aware that it is no easy task. In fact, Government have very serious difficulties to encounter in bringing about this great change in the pattern of holdings. But merely because we have difficulties, we cannot stop short of doing something which is so necessary for the welfare of the people of our State and our country.

We were cautioned by the elder statesman, Dr. Mahomed Usman, that we should hasten slow in this matter. I am not sure that as soon as the land ceilings are proposed, immediately, overnight Government will be able to form co-operatives all over the State and plunge the whole country into a new method and system of cultivation and that we will have an El Dorado overnight. We are not pretending that any such thing will happen. Naturally, we will have to proceed slow in this matter of forming co-operatives in the various places and trying to help them to tackle problems which may be created as a result of the new experiment we are making. While I assure that Government would take every care to see that there is no serious unsettlement in the economy of this country as a result of the adoption of this policy, I would only re-emphasise that the Government stand committed to this policy of fixation of ceiling on land.

[Sri R. Venkataraman] [11th February 1959

3-39 p.m. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition said that it was a pity that the Opposition was not consulted in important matters like this. Sir, you are aware so far as the Madras Government are concerned, not only do we inform the Opposition of very many matters in which common interests are involved but we take them into active consultation at every stage. But there are some occasions on which it would not be possible to take the Opposition into consultation in framing policies, economic policies of the Government. The well-known difference lies in the foreign policy of a country and the economic policy of a Party. Usually, the foreign policy of a country is treated as a bipartisan policy where both sides take active interest and part in the formulation of the foreign policy. But, in the case of economic policies of the particular Party in question, the Party has to take the decision and stand or fall by that decision. Here the decision of the Party is that land ceiling should be fixed and that the surplus land should be transferred for co-operative cultivation. This is a decision by which we as Party have to stand or fall at the next election. After this policy has been adopted, it would be quite possible for Government to take into consultation all sections of opinion for the purpose of efficiently carrying out the policy and to see that all the hurdles are smoothened or removed and that in the administration the difficulties are solved. But in the enunciation of the policy itself the responsibility cannot be shared with others and such a sharing of responsibility would amount to only shirking of responsibility. I am quite sure I cannot ask my esteemed Friend Sri Balasubramanya Ayyar to come and support me in saying that there should be a ceiling on land holdings. (Sri A. M. Allapichai : In course of time, he will offer support.)

Then, with regard to the manner in which this decision was taken, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition had some caustic comments to make. He said that Madras should not become the leader in obeying mandates. In this as in many other things, Madras had rather led than obeyed mandates of other States or other people. In most of the things that Madras has done, it has given the lead to the other parts of the country. In this matter also the Party at its convention discussed the question. It is but democratic that during the discussion Members holding different points of view should put them forward for consideration within their own Party. To say that one Member of our Government took one view at Hyderabad and another view at Nagpur is only to ignore the basic principle of democracy where people do have to put forward their different points of view for the purpose of arriving at something which is acceptable to all.

The Hon. Sri C. SUBRAMANIAM : I owe a personal explanation because it was mentioned here that I took one point of view in Hyderabad and another point of view at Nagpur. It is completely wrong altogether. What I stressed in Hyderabad was that we should not break up the existing big holdings. I did not say that they should be left with the landowners themselves but that only big holdings could produce results and that, therefore, whatever step

11th February 1959] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

we might take, it should be with reference to the creation of big estates rather than breaking up the existing big estates. With reference to that, I said that a formula should be evolved. I am glad that with reference to that, I was able to offer a formula and that that has been accepted. Therefore, there is no question of my going back upon the views I expressed at Hyderabad. On the other hand, my views have been accepted. It is on the basis of those views that the present policy has been framed.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Now, the whole thing is set at rest. I was going to say that this idea of co-operative cultivation of the surplus land was itself a lead which was given by the Madras Government. Therefore, we have every reason to be proud rather than feel ashamed of anything that we did anywhere. The position finally boils down to this. The Members representing different points of view met at a committee. At the committee it was suggested that after the ceiling was fixed, the surplus should be formed into a co-operative and that it should be a service co-operative to start with so that the people might still continue to hold the land but would come together for the purpose of having common services, common facilities and so on and that if, after some years of experiment, they feel bold enough or strong enough to come forward to have joint farming, then they might try. All my endeavour is, therefore, only to show that this is not going to create such a serious unsettlement in this country as a result of following this policy. Actually, the persons who are now working under some landlord would still be working on the same land but under a co-operative. Actually, there is only a legal, technical shift or change and very little of physical changes. It is only physical changes that bring about chaos and physical changes of a large magnitude will certainly bring about greater confusion. But in the way in which things are now contemplated there will be very little of shift of persons and very little of physical changes with the result that the policy is not likely to create any difficulties. On the other hand, we have every hope that the new policy which we inaugurate will usher in an era of plenty and prosperity, that the persons who are engaged in it would be enthused to do better work and that the production of food in this country would go up to meet at least the needs of our own pepole.

Sir, allied to this question is the question of food prices. A number of hon. Members commented very severely on the increase or rise in prices. The rise in prices, as you are aware, may be due to two factors. One is the shortage of supply of the commodity. The other is based on the general rise in the trend of prices throughout the country consequent on other economic factors like larger investment, greater credit facilities, tempo of activity and so on. It is my submission that the general trend in the rise of prices is due to the tempo of activity in this country, the heavier investments caused by the intensive execution of the Second Five-Year Plan, and that it is not as a result of any serious shortage that has occurred in this State. Hon. Members asked the question how it was

[Sri R. Venkataraman] [11th February 1959

consistent with reason that while the Food Minister continued to say that production had increased in the State, the prices were still rising. If you understand the distinction between a rise in prices caused by shortage of commodities and a rise in prices brought about by greater investment and tempo of activity, we could easily find that they are both reconcilable and true. In this case, I have a few figures which might allay the doubts and fears of the hon. Members of this House. Actually, the production in the year 1957–58 of rice is 32·34 lakhs of tons and 1956–57 it was 31·03 lakhs of tons. Similarly in millets, there has been an increase of 1.5 lakh tons. The overall total for 1956–57 is 46·22 lakh tons. In 1957–58, it
3 40 p.m. was 49·20 lakh tons. Therefore, the figures that we have with us go to show that there has been no decrease in the production of food in the State. On the other hand, there is a very healthy trend towards increase in food production, and it is not as a result of any decrease in production that this situation has arisen. On the other hand, it is because of the tempo of activity in the State. I am also aware that, to some extent, the increase in population offsets the increase in food production. But, in my opinion, it is not so much the increase in population as the tempo of investment and economic activity that is mainly responsible for the higher trend in prices not only in agriculture but in every other sphere of activity.

Then, Sir, certain alarming figures were given by my esteemed Friend Sri Srinivasavaradan that prices were going up, and that if this increase in prices was not tackled, very serious consequences would follow. Sir, the figures do not justify such an apprehensive outlook. The figure for September 1958 at Cuddalore was Rs. 20 per bag. In October it was Rs. 21. In November it was Rs. 21. In December it was Rs. 20. In January it was Rs. 20·35. Therefore, there has been a fairly steady price level in respect of food, but I know that the retail prices are going up owing to various other factors including speculation. Sir, the moment the Government said that there would be some sort of a control, everybody had started sitting pretty and holding tight to the stocks. I am told that even the Andhra dealers are not willing to sell now, because they think that they are not obliged to sell at the particular price fixed by the Government. The Government have not taken steps to fix the retail price because it would be very difficult now to do it at this stage. The idea is that Government would procure about two lakhs of tons of rice and, as and when the situation demands, release it so that the prices charged by all other private dealers may be brought down to the level at which the Government issue will take place. Actually out of 32 lakhs tons of rice, which is produced in this State, only about ten or twelve lakhs of tons enter the market. The rest is all consumed at the place of production, and it is seldom brought for sale. If we are able to procure two lakh tons out of this ten or twelve lakh tons, it would give us a sufficient stock for the purpose of meeting an emergency. Therefore, we have every hope that the situation can be handled by Government by releasing the stock as and when the prices show a tendency to go up abnormally.

11th February 1959] [Sri R. Venkataraman]

Then, Sir, there was criticism regarding the grant-in-aid in respect of the elementary schools. My esteemed Friend Sri G. Krishnamoorthy said that it was against the Constitution to charge fees in elementary schools. Article 45 of the Constitution does not say that no fee should be charged for elementary education. All that it says is that elementary education should be available and should be made free and compulsory. Sir, by providing free primary schools, the Government would be satisfying the Constitution. I do not think I need take much time over this. But the hon. Member was referring to another more important question, that is, the question of the closure of schools in Madras and other places consequent on the order issued by the Education Department. My Friend knows that long ago, the Alagappa Chettiar Committee recommended that no fee should be charged in elementary schools. It is in pursuance of this recommendation that Government have been taking various steps, and ultimately they issued the order in November 1958 saying that if the aided primary schools wanted to charge fee, they would not be entitled to the grant and assistance. But if they converted themselves into free schools, they would be entitled to the grant and assistance according to the pattern to be decided. My Friend said that as a result of this policy, a number of schools would be closed and that the children would be deprived of education. Sir, we have some figures in regard to the number of elementary schools in the State. In 1956-57, the total number of elementary schools in the State was 20,946, of which 1,351 were under Government. Twelve thousand seven hundred and sixty-eight schools were under local bodies and 6,827 schools were under private agencies. Of these, 900 aided elementary schools alone levied fees, and about 150 of them are in Madras City. Therefore, the problem reduces itself to very, very small proportions. The Hon. the Minister for Education in the other House reiterated that the Government would be able to give education to every child should there be any closure of the aided elementary schools. He also gave the assurance that the teachers would be absorbed in the various institutions that would come up as a result of the closure of the elementary schools. Therefore, I beg to submit to this Hon. House that there is really no case at all for apprehension that our educational system is breaking down or that we are going to face a great crisis in the elementary education of our children.

Sir, the other matters are all comparatively of smaller significance. Reference was made to the needs of the Non-Gazetted Officers. One hon. Member, Sri V. V. Ramaswami, said that they should be given a minimum of Rs. 100 (Sri V. V. Ramaswami : Basic). The Government are not keen on sweating anybody much less their own employees. But every good intention has got to be supported by the capacity to perform and discharge it. At present, our position is not so good as to be able to afford what we think is their legitimate due. The Government do not, for a moment, contend that the salaries that are paid to the Non-Gazetted Officers are adequate or that they are being treated very liberally or that

they have no cause for complaint. But all that Government have been trying to show to the Legislature as well as to the country is that in the existing context of events of our finances, it has not been possible to do much more. The Government have also pointed out that in the general economic development of this country, emphasis has naturally to be laid on schemes of rural development, on extension of electricity, on the establishment of cottage and village industries as much, if not more than, on the increase of the emoluments of their own employees. In a fair distribution of
3-50 p.m. the resources of this State, the Government have been able to afford an increase of Rs. 5 in dearness allowance. That is a pointer that as and when the Government are able to give more, can afford to give more, they will always be willing to do so. In this connection, I want to emphasise that the appointment of a Commission under Sri Ramunni Menon should be welcomed by all people. There is a lurking feeling that the presiding officer should have been a Judge instead of an Executive Officer, a retired Executive Officer. But, so long as the functions which have been entrusted to the Chairman are such that he has to exercise a certain amount of independent judgment and so long as the person who is entrusted with that task is aware of it, it matters very little what office one had previously held. So far as the particular person is concerned, it is well-known that he has the greatest sympathy for the people who had been serving him when he was in office. Therefore, I do not think it is necessary for either the Non-Gazetted Government servants or for others to lay too much stress on the personnel of the Commission.

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Sir, with your permission, may I interrupt the Hon. Minister so that he may also have some rest? If really Sri Ramunni Menon is so sympathetic towards the Government servants, as was pointed out by the Hon. Minister just now in the House, are the Non-Gazetted Officers so foolhardy and unwise as to oppose his appointment? What are the reasons for their opposition? The Hon. Minister must know the reasons why his own employees are opposing the appointment of Sri Ramunni Menon on the proposed Pay Commission. We would like to know what those reasons are.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : As for the reasons which impelled them to criticise the appointment of Sri Ramunni Menon, I think the question should be addressed to them. But, I can say that there is no foundation for that criticism. Because, knowing as we do the type of officers who have held these positions—Sri Ramunni Menon has been a member of the Indian Civil Service and has been a distinguished member of it—we are aware that they have always discharged their duties without fear or favour. Therefore, I thought that the objection was not well-founded. If the hon. Members of the House are convinced that the objection is not well-founded, I have absolutely no doubt that the Non-Gazetted Government Officers will also begin to think in the same way.

11th February 1959]

SRI A. GAJAPATHY NAYAGAR : What about abolishing the system of confidential files?

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Now, I come to the very small question of holding the meetings of the Legislature in Ootacamund. I want to make it very clear to the House that the Government were not anxious to move to Ooty. In fact, the Government felt that the difficulties and inconvenience of meeting in Ooty far outweighed the advantages thereof. But, at the same time, a democratic Government has to yield generally to the wishes of a large section of the legislators as well as the people. It is well-known that Ooty has been one of the prides of India. In fact, it has been called the 'Queen of Hill Stations' in India and everyone knows that it is now slowly withering because of lack of attractions there. I know that the people do not even go and spend their time in Ooty nowadays because there is not the company of those they used to have in that place in the past. What shall we do to improve a beautiful place like this? What we should do to improve the various health resorts is a question which was discussed by the Members of the Legislature and others. I want to put it squarely, Sir, that in agreeing to meet in Ootacamund, the Government have actually yielded to the desire of a large section of the Legislature rather than decided of their own volition. I do not think it is such a bad decision or such seriously wrong decision as to be raised in debates. (Interruption). I said it was a beautiful place and I did not say 'beauty'.

Sir, the hon. Member Sri Patanjali Sastry, in the course of his address, drew the pointed attention of the Government to the lack of medical facilities in the State and he said that many of the rural dispensaries were now left without any medical assistance. The Government are very keenly aware of the difficulties in this regard. In fact, it has not been possible for us to find enough doctors to man the primary health centres. I have myself tried to open a number of these Employees State Insurance hospitals. Even that scheme has been delayed on account of lack of qualified and trained doctors.

DR. A. SREENIVASAN : Sir, may I know whether the Government have examined the reasons why they were not able to attract properly qualified men to man the rural dispensaries, especially when so many Graduates are being turned out every year?

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Sir, there may be some reasons or other for each person. I do not think that there can be a general statement or general reason for all of them. Some people may prefer to remain in the City and so, they may not like to go to the villages. Some people may not be attracted by the salaries offered there. Some people may have various other reasons. But, the suggestion made by the hon. Member was that in order to meet this deficiency, it should be possible for the Government to consider the question of having Homoeopathy taught regularly in an institution and qualified and trained doctors prepared in these

[Sri R. Venkataraman] [11th February 1959

institutions and made use of for these purposes. During my talks with my Colleague the Hon. the Minister for Health, I understood that the Government had a scheme for recognizing the institution of Homoeopathy. So, the matter is under the active consideration of the Government and I am quite sure that Madras will not lag behind other States which have tried to have colleges of this kind and which have provided opportunities in this regard.

SRI V. V. RAMASWAMI : நீங்கள் எங்கே ஆரம்பிக்கப் போகிறீர்கள் ? நாங்கள் ஆரம்பித்தால் உதவிசெய்வீர்களா என்று சொல்லுங்கள் ?

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Yes, Sir, the Government are not opposed to it and we will do everything to encourage it.

SRI A. GAJAPATHY NAYAGAR : Are the Government thinking of integrating Homoeopathy in the College of Integrated Medicine?

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : My hon. Friend Sri Gajapathy Nayagar will please put in an interpellation based on the statement which I am making.

I have fairly dealt with the major points. As I said just now, I do not desire to go into the details of the various other matters that have been raised in the course of the debate. We would very much desire to get the approval of the House for the policies put forward before it. I am grateful to the hon. Members of this House for the kindness they have shown me and I trust that in the years to come we will have the utmost co-operation of all sections of the House in carrying out the trust which the people have placed in us. Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Raza Khan, are you pressing your amendment?

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Sir, the request for withdrawing the amendment should come from the Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I did not ask the hon. Member to withdraw the amendment. I only wanted to know whether he was pressing his amendment.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I now formally request the Whip of the Opposition to be good enough to withdraw his amendment. I thought that he was so happy after my speech and that he felt convinceed, but I am sadly mistaken. Nor, I am requesting him to withdraw his amendment.

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : While I do not agree that the Hon. Minister's reply was completely satisfactory, as the tone of his reply was tolerable, I formally do not press my amendment.

The amendment moved by Sri Mohamed Raza Khan was, by leave, withdrawn.

11th February 1959]

MR. CHAIRMAN : I shall now put the original motion to vote. The question is—

" That an humble Address be presented to the Governor that the Members of the Madras Legislative Council thank him for the Address delivered to the Members of the Legislature on the 4th February 1959."

The motion was put and carried.

III.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE TIRUCHIRAPPALLI KAIAERUVARAM AND MATTUVARAM BILL, 1958 (L.A. BILL NO. 25 OF 1958).

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Hon. Mr. Manickavelu will now move the Tiruchirappalli *Kaiaeruvaram* and *Mattuvaram* Bill, 1958. 4 p.m.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, I move—

" That the Tiruchirappalli *Kaiaeruvaram* and *Mattuvaram* Bill [a], 1958 (L.A. Bill No. 25 of 1958), as passed by the Legislative Assembly, be taken into consideration."

The Madras High Court has held that *kaiaeruvaramdars* and *mattuvaramdars* in Tiruchirappalli district engaged by landlords to work on land for remuneration by a share in the crop on such land are not " *cultivating tenants* " within the meaning of section 2 (*a*) of the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection Act, 1955 (Madras Act XXV of 1955). The definition of " cultivating tenant " in the Madras Cultivating Tenants (Payment of Fair Rent) Act, 1956 (Madras Act XXIV of 1956) is similar to that in Madras Act XXV of 1955. It was considered that these varamdars in the Tiruchirappalli district should get the benefits which the cultivating tenants were getting under these two enactments. With a view to achieve this object, an Ordinance called the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection and Payment of Fair Rent (Amendment) Ordinance, 1958 (Madras Ordinance I of 1958), was promulgated on 5th January 1958. In February 1958 a Bill to replace the Ordinance was introduced in the Legislative Assembly and was referred to a Joint Select Committee.

The Joint Select Committee considered that the Bill might be dropped and a new Bill introduced for giving effect to the following purposes :—

(1) The *kaiaeruvaramdars* be treated on a par with " pannaiyals " and their rights protected, as in the Tanjore Panaiyal Protection Act, 1952 (Madras Act XIV of 1952).

(2) The small landowners owning three acres and less and without any other means of livelihood and who do not pay sales tax or income-tax be completely exempted from the provisions of the Act.

[a] Printed as Appendix II on pages 252–258 infra.